REMARKS

Claims 1-24 were pending when last examined. With this Response, Applicant has cancelled Claims 3-5, 11-13, and 19-21, amended Claims 1, 9, and 17, and added new Claims 25-37. All pending claims are shown in the detailed listing above.

Specification

The Examiner states, "The application contains numerous related application (see pages 1), which contains missing information such as serial numbers. Applicant is requested to update the status of the related applications."

In response, Applicant has amended the specification to update the status of related applications.

Double Patenting

Claims 1, 9, and 17 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 9, and 17 of co-pending Application No(s). 09/835,116 ("the '116 application") and 09/835,086 ("the '086 application").

Since neither of the '116 application nor the '086 application has yet been allowed or issued, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be held in abeyance. Applicant will submit a Terminal Disclaimer as appropriate in the future (i.e., when the claims of one of these applications have been allowed).

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claim 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,343,313 to Salesky et al. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant has cancelled Claims 3-5, 11-13, and 19-21, thereby rendering moot the rejection of these claims.

With regard to the remaining claims, Claim 1 as amended recites in pertinent part, "if the non-shared application window overlaps the shared application window, determining a position and a size of an overlapping region;" and "transmitting the screen shot and information for the overlapping region to a viewer." Such claimed limitations are not disclosed or taught by Salesky et al.

The Examiner argues (in rejecting claims 4 and 5) that Salesky et al. teaches a method comprising "if the non-shared application window overlaps the shared application window, determining a position and a size of an overlapping region...." The Examiner further argues that Salesky et al. teaches "transmitting the overlapping region to a viewer." Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner's arguments are not supported by the citations to and the language of Salesky et al. provided by the Examiner. Indeed, it is clear that the Examiner is *merely speculating* on what *could* happen in the context of Salesky et al. In particular, while Salesky et al. may disclose that some regions may overlap, Salesky et al. certainly does not teach or suggest an *active step* of "determining a position and a size of an overlapping region" as recited in Applicant's Claim 1. Nor does Salesky et al. teach or suggest "transmitting the screen shot and information for the overlapping region to a viewer." Thus, Claim 1 as amended is not anticipated by the cited reference. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art.

Like Claim 1, Claim 9 as amended recites in pertinent part, "if the non-shared application window overlaps the shared application window, determining a position and a size of an overlapping region" and "transmitting the screen shot and information for the overlapping region to a viewer." Similarly, Claim 17 as amended recites in pertinent part, "if the non-shared application window overlaps the shared application window, determining a

position and a size of an overlapping region" and "transmitting the screen shot and information for the overlapping region to the viewer computer." Claims 9 and 17 are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1, 9, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and these claims be allowed. Each of Claims 2, 6-8, 10, 14-16, 18, and 22-24 depend from one of Claims 1, 9, and 17 and include further limitations. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 2, 6-8, 10, 14-16, 18, and 22-24 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and these claims be allowed.

New Claims

New Claims 25-37 have been added with this Response to further define Applicant's invention. Applicant respectfully submits that new Claims 25-37 are fully supported by the Application as filed, add no new matter, and are allowable over the prior art of record.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue. Should the Examiner wish to discuss the Application, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (415) 772-1200.

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL NO.:
EV 611 226 151 US

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

Philip W. Woo
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 39,880
PWW/rp

October 20, 2004

SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP
555 California Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94104-1715
(415) 772-7200